UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,864	11/15/2005	Alon Lelcuk	LELCUK1	2260

1444 7590 10/09/2008

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
624 NINTH STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER	
PHAN, MAN U	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2419	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/530,864	LELCUK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Man Phan	2419	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 November 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/26/08, 12/21/07, 7/24/06, 6/16/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The application of Lelcuk et al. for the "Method and apparatus for a service integration system" filed 11/15/2005 has been examined. This application is a national stage entry of PCT/IL03/00767 International Filing Date: 09/25/2003 Which Claims Priority from Provisional Application 60416914, filed 10/09/2002. Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

2. The applicant should use this period for response to thoroughly and very closely proof read and review the whole of the application for correct correlation between reference numerals in the textual portion of the Specification and Drawings along with any minor spelling errors, general typographical errors, accuracy, assurance of proper use for Trademarks ™, and other legal symbols @, where required, and clarity of meaning in the Specification, Drawings, and specifically the claims (i.e., provide proper antecedent basis for "the" and "said" within each claim). Minor typographical errors could render a Patent unenforceable and so the applicant is strongly encouraged to aid in this endeavor.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means"

and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The Abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains more than 250 words and it contains the phraseology word "means" on line 20. Correction is required. See MPEP 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

4. Claims 5-17, 25-26 are objected to because of the following informalities: On line 2 (claim 5), on line 1 (claims 6-17) and on lines 1, 3 (claims 7, 15), "service integration system" should be changed to --distributed service integration system-- for the consistency of the claims.

5. Claims 1 and 14, 15 are objected to because of the following informalities: On line 14 (claim 1) and on line 1 (claim 14, 15), "resource control element" should be changed to –resource control module-- for the consistency of the claims.

6. Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities: On line 6, "cannels" should be changed to –channels--

Appropriate correction is required.

7. Claims 16 and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The claims contain the phrase "*capable of*". It has been held that the recitation that an element is "*capable of*" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the

ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchison, 69 USPQ 138.* Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 18 recites the limitation "*the flow of data*" in line 11 and "the components" on line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites "*resource control module*" in line 11, and "*resource control element*" in line12. It is not clear whether these refer to the same limitation.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "*said distributed architecture*" in line 1 and "the components" on line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "*the different sessions*" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "*the TappS 10 system*" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 3, 12 recite the limitation "*one module*", "*one functional module*" and " *one functional module element*". It is not clear whether these refer to the same limitation.

Claims 14-15 recite the limitation "*resource control element*" in line 1. It is not clear whether this refers to the same limitation as "*resource control module*".

Claim 14 recites the limitation "*the system administrator*" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "*said at least one executable state machine*" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "*said service integration system*" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "*said service integration system*" in lines 4, 6, 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deo et al. (US#6,393,481) in view of Dubois et al. (US#2002/0154646).

In so far as understood, with respect to claims 1-4, 18, the reference disclose a method and system for providing real time call processing services utilizing control processing module, according to the essential features of the claims. Deo et al. (US#6,393,481) discloses in Fig.4(b) a block diagram illustrated the functionality of the service administration component 300, in which the Service Administration component 500 is a component that performs all of the functions needed to manage, store, and distribute all services and service data used by IDNA service processing nodes and to configure both the hardware and software components implemented in the system IDNA/NGIN. The SA component 500 is responsible for: receiving the data from MOCE (Service Creation) 228, receiving customer order data 502 from order entry and other legacy systems 229 to provision the IDNA/NGIN system for use by customers; deploying data, Service Independent Building Blocks ("SIBBs") , Service Logic Programs ("SLPs") , and other service logic components 503, e.g., to the MOCE 200 as requested by MOCE/SCE users. As shown in Fig. 4(b), the Service Administration component 500 further performs the function of configuring and provisioning the IDNA/NGIN service nodes 204 in accordance with configuration information that SA receives. Particularly, based on the received configuration information, the SA component 500 determines the capabilities of each component at each service node 204, which services and data to distribute to which nodes, which services will run on which server(s) resident at the service node, and which data will be cached to local memory resident associated with IDNA/NGIN node server(s). Particularly, SA deploys configuration rules contained in service profile (configuration) files 580 to a Local (node)

Resource Manager ("LRM") component 575 of the NOS system 700 for storage in the local LRM cache located at each service node. These configuration files 580 determine which services to execute at an IDNA node. The LRM first reads this service profile file 580 stored in the local cache at that node, and determines a specific Service Layer Execution Environment ("SLEE"), e.g., a virtual machine, to run a service on in accordance with the rules in the service profile file and, which services are to run actively (as persistent objects) in the SLEE, or are to be instantiated only on-demand. Deo further discxloses in Fig. 5 a block diagram illustrated a logical and functional diagram of a telecommunications system employing an intelligent distributed network architecture 200, in which the ICP 172 is shown to contain an ICP-NMS Agent 240 and a SLEE 242 that, in turn, hosts a variety of managed objects 246, 248, 250 and 252 derived from the managed objects base class 244 (See also Fig. 12a; Col. 12, lines 4 plus and Col. 13, lines 40 plus).

In the same field of endeavor, Dubois et al. (US#2002/0154646) teaches a programmable network services node system for providing call services to subscribers, the system having a control processing module, a communications resource module having a network interface which may be connected to an external network, a digital signal processing resource module having a circuit network which may be connected to an external circuit switch network, a switching resource module and an access processing module. The control processing module can provide platform processing control of the system and can also process received services programming instructions and the communications resource module can perform call processing. The switching resource module can provide switching controls within the system and the access processing module can provide access processing control within the system. The system may

also have a meshed network which is populated by the communications resource module(s) and the digital signal processing resource module(s) ([0004]-[0013]). It's noted that it is well known and expected in the art of communications to have network management system agents running in the network nodes coupled to the processor to monitor and managing the resources on the network nodes and communicate with the central management system in order to implement a more efficient network management system.

Regarding claim 5, Deo further teaches in Figs. 8-10 the service control environment for a distributed service integration system for communication networks to provide fault tolerance, performance and capacity (Col. 29, lines 58 plus).

Regarding claims 6-8, Deo teaches the service integration system controls the amount of resource allocates to different sessions (Fig. 10; Col. 29, lines 58 plus).

Regarding claims 9-11, 25-26, Deo teaches wherein the network is a real time voice, video communication with data communication (See Fig. 1 and the Abstract).

Regarding claims 12-15, 17, Deo teaches in Fig. 4c a functional architecture of the data management component includes the functional module, state machine controller, memory (Col. 28, lines 28 plus)

Regarding claims 16, 19, Deo et al. (US#6,393,481) further teaches in Fig.4(b) a block diagram illustrated the functionality of the service administration component 300, in which the service integration system is a deployment of services, execution services and management services (Col. 12, lines 4 plus and Col. 13, lines 40 plus).

Regarding claims 20-24, they are method claims corresponding to the system claims 1-19, 25-26 above. Therefore, claims 20-24 are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed in

paragraph above with respect to claims 1-19, 25-26.

One skilled in the art would have recognized the need for effectively and efficiently facilitates communications control modules to provide a distributed service integration system that enables the deployment, execution and management of network services, and would have applied Dubois' novel use of the control processing modules for providing call services to subscribers into Deo's system and methodology for providing real time call processing services. Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply Dubois's programmable network services node into Deo's method and apparatus for providing real time call processing services in a intelligent network with the motivation being to provide a method and system for a service integration system.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The Dugan et al. (US#7,061,923) is cited to show the method and apparatus for managing local resources at service nodes in an intelligent network.

The Dugan et al. (US#6,425,005) is cited to show the method and apparatus for managing local resources at service nodes in an intelligent network.

The Dugan et al. (US#6,804,711) is cited to show the method and apparatus for managing call processing services in an intelligent telecommunication network.

The Bonnell et al. (US#5,655,081) is cited to show the system for monitoring and managing computer resources and applications across a distributed computing environment using an intelligent autonomous agent architecture.

The Barnhouse et al. (US#6,418,461) is cited to show the intelligent call switching node in an intelligent distributed network architecture.

The Deo et al. (US#2005/0165906) show the deploying service modules among service nodes distributed in an intelligent network.

The Baum et al. (US#7,170,905) show the vertical services integration enabled content distribution mechanisms.

The Voit et al. (US#6,829,250) is cited to show the automatic programming of customer premises equipment for vertical services integration.

The Voit et al. (US#6,798,751) is cited to show the customer premises equipment for vertical services integration.

The Suzuki (US#2002/0156925) is cited to show the gateway system and integrated management method.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Phan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3149. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri from 6:00 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at toll free 1-866-217-9197.

Mphan

10/06/2008

/Man Phan/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2619